

teeming, protected by its own private police force. The Somali shilling was trading at stable rates—with no protection at all. And a half-dozen crude newspapers were circulating freely.

Most hopeful of all, we saw practically no guns on the street and heard almost none at night. Disarmament, the elusive goal of American and U.N. peacekeepers, finally seemed to be occurring in their absence, perhaps spontaneously.

To be sure, the only schools operating were Koranic schools. The only regularly scheduled air service carried bales of khat, the Somalis' narcotic of choice. The only telephones were satellite links. The only electricity came from noisy private generators, though it was often shared among neighbors. The only water came from private wells, and there wasn't much of it.

Hospitals were dismal and might as well have been closed. Drugs cost a fortune. Rubble and wreckage still choked the streets. Some buildings had been cleaned up windows replaced and shell holes patched, but we saw little major renovation. And the big problem on everyone's mind was how to create jobs for the youngsters who'd gone to war instead of to school. In a word, there was more poverty than progress in Aided's "new" Somalia—but at least no one seemed to be starving.

Was this just a "show" for foreign guests, as several Aided critics whispered to us? Or were Somalis themselves finally putting their nation and their political system back together again, absent our help?

As Powell observed of the people here: "They had been solving their political problems for a thousand years before Jeffersonian democracy came upon the scene."

Somalia Lesson No. 3: Even overwhelming force can't solve another people's political problems. They must do that for themselves.

When we lunched with Aided one afternoon before leaving Baidoa, I read him some excerpts from The Post's interview with his old adversary. He was fascinated. It was no surprise that he agreed with Powell's central point: We should have stopped while we were ahead.

But what bothered Aided wasn't so much our arrogance as our ignorance. "I think if Americans had tried to understand our system, our traditions, our history, our way of life before sending troops and experts into Somalia to change everything," he reflected, "we would still be close friends."

Perhaps. But it was fortunate for Somalia that Americans hurried to lend a helping hand, even as we were slow to understand how a nation can collapse in turmoil and misery. Had we delayed our intervention until we "understood" the conflict's root causes, many thousands more would have died and clan warfare might yet be raging.

Gen. Powell would probably agree.●

HEAD-IN-THE-SAND FOREIGN POLICY

● Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, the Washington Post on Monday, October 16, 1995, ran a column by Jessica Mathews that is absolutely on target.

My colleagues have heard me speak before about the need for a more responsible foreign policy.

I thought it was particularly fascinating to note the quotation in the Jessica Mathews column that it costs \$600 million less to run the United Nations than it does the New York City police department.

How foolish we are to fail to do what we should in support of a more enlight-

ened and responsible international policy.

I ask that the Jessica Mathews column be printed in the RECORD at this point, and I urge my colleagues to read it.

The column follows:

HEAD-IN-THE-SAND FOREIGN POLICY

(By Jessica Mathews)

A dispassionate foreign observer of Congress's budget choices would have to conclude that Americans' only international aspiration is to be global policemen. Or, to be scrupulously fair, policeman with a handout for refugees and the most wretched victims of disaster.

That isn't what Americans want, but its' what—unless drastic adjustments are made in the next few weeks of bargaining—they're going to get. In both the House and Senate versions of next year's budget every means of keeping the peace short of military action and every other cost of international leadership or national self-interest—political, economic, environmental, humanitarian—is stripped to near or below the minimum while more money than the Pentagon thinks it can usefully spend is crammed down its throat.

In round numbers, Congress has added \$7 billion to a \$220 billion military total that already dwarfs what all of the rest of the world outside NATO spends on defense. Meanwhile, in the name of deficit reduction, it is planning to cut \$3 billion to \$4 billion from all other international spending. That may not sound like much but it amounts to 15 percent to 20 percent of the \$20 billion total in international affairs spending and includes reductions for most international agencies of 25 percent to 60 percent.

The cuts mean that U.S. embassies and consulates will close when a globalizing economy and more independent countries mean that more should be opening. They translate into fewer foreign service officers, hamstrung diplomacy and less of the most cost-efficient means of intelligence gathering. They mean long lines and poor services for Americans at home and abroad. All of that is tolerable, if neither sensible nor necessary, given defense increases.

What will really hurt American interests—indeed already has—are the cuts to the United Nations, the World Bank's fund for the poorest countries and the host of small international agencies that provide hundreds of services Americans need and value and underpin agreements that both parties have spent years of tough negotiating to achieve.

Where the cuts are in dues for which the United States is legally committed, as are its U.N. dues, the cost will be measured in an unraveling of international law not limited to finances. If the United States can renege on its funding obligations why can't X on Y (fill in the country and topic of your choice)?

Even where the cuts are in voluntary contributions, the result of a U.S. pull back from the international community along a front that reaches from peacekeeping to environmental protection will be a declining interest on the part of other countries in supporting U.S. initiatives. That will fuel further disenchantment in the United States etc., with results that no one wants.

The cycle has already begun. The United States owes the U.N. \$1.5 billion, a debt that threatens to tip that institution into insolvency. The U.N. is limping along by not paying what it owes to contractors and to countries that supply its peacekeeping troops. In effect, the likes of Pakistan and Bangladesh are covering our bad check.

Congress wants to see organizational reforms at the U.N. before it will consider even a partial payment. But for the rest of the

world, the No. 1 item on the agenda is that a country that can afford to do so does not pay its dues year after year. As Britain's foreign secretary remarked to an appreciative audience, the United States seems to want "representation without taxation."

Part of what has brought us to this sorry pass is too many years of cheap shot—and now almost obligatory—political rhetoric that has inflated the self-evident need for U.N. reform into a problem of unrecognizable dimensions in the minds of most Americans. Even while defending the U.N., U.S. Ambassador Madeline Albright called it "elephantine." It took Australia's Gareth Evans to provide some perspective by pointing out that the U.N.'s secretariat and core functions (in New York, Geneva, Vienna, Nairobi and the Hague) cost \$600 million less than the New York City Police Department. Adding the development, environment and population agencies, the huge refugee operation, UNICEF and others, the total is still less than Congress's defense add-on.

Having launched a last-minute effort to reduce U.N. funds and the rest of the international affairs budget, the administration is battling a sentiment it helped create by blaming the United Nations for its own mistakes in Somalia and Bosnia, and an attitude on the part of congressional freshmen for which the politest description is a profound and willful ignorance of America's role in the world, its obligations, its interests and what it takes to meet them.

However long it takes, this struggle deserves attention and public support. No American doubts the need for a superlative military. But it should be obvious by now that the best-armed force in the world cannot meet more than a fraction of the threats of the post-Cold War world nor help seize most of its opportunities. An America served by a rich military budget and impoverished funding for every other international function will be a country both poorer and less secure than it should be.●

ALL BETTER NOW

● Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, a longtime friend who headed my Illinois operation for many years and still is associated with me, Jerry Sinclair, once again showed why he is a valuable friend by sending a column that appeared in World Business in their September-October 1995 issue.

It deals with the Canadian health care system written by Diane Francis, the editor of Canada's foremost business newspaper, the Financial Post. It views things from a business perspective. She is the author of five books on business.

Ms. Francis spells out very clearly why the Canadian health care system is far superior to the United States system.

The propaganda spread against the Canadian system here in the United States by those who profit from the present system terribly distorts what the Canadians have. This column helps to balance that.

I would add, in the last poll I saw of Canadian citizens, exactly 3 percent of them said they would prefer the United States system of health care to theirs. That does not, as this column points out, suggest there are no problems with the Canadian system. But they deliver superior health care to their

citizens. We spend more and do a worse job.

Ms. Francis quotes a Peat Marwick 1995 study titled, "A Comparison of Business Costs in Canada and the United States."

Listen to this analysis: "Costs of hospitals, surgical, medical, and major medical insurance premiums are the prime reason for the difference in costs. These insurance premiums represent a cost of 8.2 percent of gross pay in the United States compared with 1.0 percent in Canada."

American businesses who, frankly, fell down on the job, when they should have been backing the Clinton plan, ought to be taking a good look at what is happening in Canada.

I ask unanimous consent that the Diane Francis column be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point.

The column follows:

ALL BETTER NOW

Among the health care systems of the world's wealthiest industrialized countries, the United States' is the most expensive; even worse, it fails to provide health care for all Americans. Canada, on the other hand, provides excellent, comprehensive coverage to all of its citizens. Its system, administered jointly by the federal government and the twelve provincial governments, provides Canadian business with an enormous competitive advantage. And yet vested interest in the United States—including doctors, privately owned health care facilities, and insurance companies—have lobbied against government systems such as Canada's. They say that Canadians must wait months for procedures. This is simply not the case. They would also have Americans believe that Canadian hospitals are second-rate, and that Canadian physicians are poorly trained. These are also not so.

The same type of lobbying took place in Canada in the late 1960s, when the government-run plan was first implemented. It is interesting to note that Vice President Al Gore became a fan of Canada's health system after his seriously brain-injured son was successfully operated on in Toronto by one of the world's best neurosurgical pediatrics teams.

A look at the facts leaves little doubt that the Canadian system is superior. An average of 6.3 out of every 1,000 babies born die before the age of 1 in Canada, as opposed to 8.3 in the United States. Life expectancies in Canada are 81 years for women and 74.5 for men, compared with 78.9 and 72.1 years, respectively, in the United States. Yet the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, an international monitoring group, reports that while Canada spends just 10.2 percent of its gross domestic product on health care services for all its citizens, the United States spends 14.1 percent and still has millions of citizens with inadequate or nonexistent coverage.

It isn't just the individual that benefits from Canada's comprehensive health program. The Canadian system affords business many advantages, including reduced employee costs and an expanded, healthier labor pool. According to a March 1995 study by KPMG Peat Marwick called "A Comparison of Business Costs in Canada and the United States," Canadian employers spend less on employer-sponsored benefits than their American counterparts. "Costs for hospital, surgical, medical and major medical insurance premiums are the prime reason for the difference in costs," the study says.

"These insurance premiums represent a cost of 8.2 percent of gross pay in the United States compared with 1.0 percent in Canada."

Unlike in the United States, Canadian health coverage is not tied to welfare benefits; unskilled workers can take low-paying entry-level jobs without fear of losing access to government-paid health care. This removes the possibility of creating an entrenched underclass with health problems who are handcuffed to welfare because of medical-cost issues.

Businesses in Canada are also able to hire workers regardless of their health history. This is particularly important when it comes to using the talents and efforts of senior citizens, or people with chronic illnesses. Canadian workers aren't trapped in dead-end or unsatisfactory jobs because they are afraid of losing company-provided health benefits.

Reduced labor costs are not the only corporate benefit of the Canadian system. Individuals rarely file the type of high-stakes personal injury lawsuits commonly seen in the United States. Because all citizens are guaranteed quality medical care, catastrophic medical expenses, generally the largest component of a settlement, are usually not sought when such suits are filed. In the United States, product liability insurance converge costs corporations upwards of \$500 million a year, and the premiums are growing by 20 percent to 30 percent annually. Insurance costs are dramatically lower in Canada—unless a manufacturer is exporting to the United States.

Canada's government-run workers' compensation plan is managed by the provincial governments, in contrast to the patchwork quilt of private and public systems at various levels of government in the United States. The workers' compensation premium for a Canadian autoworker in London, Ontario, is 4.56-percent of his or her wages; for an American autoworker in Minneapolis, it is 9.07 percent, according to the KPMG comparative report.

Business should be free to conduct business, and in Canada this is so. There is no need for every company to have personnel employed just to handle the paper burden of private-sector workers' compensation or health care.

Canada's systems is not perfect; nor is Canadian business able to outcompete American business at every turn as a result of cradle-to-grave medical care for its population. But the advantages to citizen and business alike are very real. And as American health care costs outpace economic growth and the country's population ages, a dose of Canadian medicine may cure what ails it. Failing that, the United States' system will make its insured workers increasingly expensive to employ and its uninsured workers increasingly unable to afford proper health care.

Diane Francis is editor of Canada's foremost business newspaper, The Financial Post, and the author of five books on business. She also writes a monthly column for Maclean's, Canada's national news magazine.●

RACIAL HARMONY IS CONTACT SPORT FOR ILLINI COACH

● Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, Recently, the Wall Street Journal had an article that deals with sports; but much more important than that, it deals with where we are in our society and what one enlightened leader, Coach Lou Tepper, is doing to bridge the gap that exists between people in our society.

The leadership he is showing on this is leadership that should provide an ex-

ample to coaches all over the country, not simply to coaches but to schools, churches, civic organizations, and many other groups.

I ask unanimous consent that the Wall Street Journal article by Frederick C. Klein be printed in the RECORD.

The article follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Oct. 13, 1995]

RACIAL HARMONY IS CONTACT SPORT FOR ILLINI COACH

(By Frederick C. Klein)

CHAMPAIGN, IL.—By now, I think, most people have come to understand that the interracial harmony they see on fields of play is more apparent than real. Black and white teammates may exchange high-fives or even hugs to celebrate moments of triumph, but once the games are over they go their separate ways, in keeping with the patterns of the society as a whole.

Mention race relations to people in sports in any capacity, and the likely response is a shrug. Few volunteer to discuss the subject, and when it does come up it's quickly brushed off. The unspoken but clear consensus is that teams exist to win games, and what their members do on their own time is their own business.

There is, however, at least one exception to this rule. Lou Tepper, the head football coach at the University of Illinois in this city amid the cornfields 150 miles south of Chicago, believes that as long as young men must get along on the gridiron in order to succeed, it'd be a shame if they didn't get to know one another better in other ways. He's made racial integration a part of his program, requiring his players to promise to get to know teammates of the other race and putting them in situations that promote such contact.

"This is a university, and I'm here as an educator," he says. "I think there ought to be more to the sports experience than what appears in the box scores."

Lest anyone get the impression that the earnest, bespectacled Mr. Tepper is insufficiently concerned with X's and O's—a high crime in big-time-college-coaching circles—he's quick to set them straight. His record is 21-19-1. He puts in the 100-hour weeks that are standard at his level of his profession, and goes around honorably bleary-eyed from his scrutiny of game films. He tells a recent visitor that the only reason he has time for more than a quick chat about next Saturday Illinois foe is that, on the week in question, there was none, his team having that Saturday off.

That said, however, he became more expansive. "Maybe I come at coaching from a different perspective than some people," he remarked. "Maybe I come at life that way, too."

That life began 50 years ago in Keystone, PA., a hamlet 50 miles south of, and, maybe, 30 years behind, Pittsburgh. Sixty-one people lived in Keystone at the time, and 31 of them were his relatives. His father, whose education ended with the eighth grade, was a janitor, and his family lived on and worked a plot of land he calls "too small to be a farm but too big to be a garden."

On his first day at the area's consolidated high school, an hour's bus ride from his home, he learned what it was like to be an outsider. "I found out quick I was a bumpkin," he says. "I talked and dressed different from the other kids. I smelled different, too; that happens when you start your day feeding pigs and chickens. Being an athlete helped me gain acceptance, but I've never forgotten how it felt to be an object of prejudice."